

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUG 04 2006

REMARKS

This paper is responsive to an Office Action mailed June 12, 2006. Prior to this response, claims 1, 3, 5-14, and 16-30 were pending. After amending claims 1, 11, 13, and 25, and canceling claims 7-10, 12, 19, 22-24, and 27-30, claims 1, 3, 5-6, 11, 13, 14, 16-18, 20-21, 25, and 26 remain pending.

In Section 3 of the Office Action claims 13, 14, 19-22, and 26, have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by Bhogal et al., US 2003/0002069.

In Section 12 of the Office Action claims 1, 3, 7-8, and 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) with respect to Bhogal in view of Kuwamoto et al., US 5,617,518.

In Section 18 of the Office Action claim 17 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) with respect to Bhogal in view of Applicant's admitted prior art.

In Section 20 of the Office Action claim 18 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) with respect to Bhogal in view of Owa et al., US 2001/0048857.

In Section 22 of the Office Action claims 23 and 27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) with respect to Bhogal in view of Vidyanand, US 6,967,728.

In Section 25 of the Office Action claim 28 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) with respect to Bhogal in view of Ueda et al., US 7,046,383.

In Section 27 of the Office Action claim 5 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) with respect to Bhogal in view of Kuwamoto et al., and Applicant's admitted prior art.

In Section 29 of the Office Action claim 6 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) with respect to Bhogal in view of Kuwamoto et al., and further in view of Owa et al.

In Section 31 of the Office Action claims 9 and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) with respect to Bhogal in view of Kuwamoto et al., and further in view of Vidyanand.

In Section 34 of the Office Action claim 29 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) with respect to Bhogal in view of Ueda, and further in view of Kuwamoto et al.


In Section 36 of the Office Action claim 30 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) with respect to Bhogal in view of Ueda, and further in view of Applicant's admitted prior art.

Section 38 states that claims 10, 11, 24, and 25 would be found allowable if rewritten to include the subject matter of the base and intervening claims. In response, claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter of claims 7-10, now canceled. All claims dependent from claim 1 should now be found allowable. Claim 13 has been amended to include the subject matter of claims 19 and 22-24, now canceled. All claims dependent from claim 13 should be found allowable. The Applicant neither expressly agrees nor disagrees with the stated reasons for allowance.

It is believed that the application is in condition for allowance and reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 8/4/2006


Gerald Maliszewski
Registration No. 38,054

Customer Number 55,286
P.O. Box 270829
San Diego, CA 92198-2829
Telephone: (858) 451-9950
Facsimile: (858) 451-9869
gerry@ipatientit.net